UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,534	10/30/2003	Steve J. Shattil	27592-00404-US3	7591
	7590 08/04/200 OVE LODGE & HUT	EXAMINER		
1875 EYE STREET, N.W. SUITE 1100 WASHINGTON, DC 20006			KIM, KEVIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2611	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/04/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/697,534	SHATTIL, STEVE J.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kevin Y. Kim	2611	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	e correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the main earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be not will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fruite, cause the application to become ABANDO	ON. timely filed om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ The 3 ☐ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal matters, p		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest is/are allowed. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-15 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 8 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and are subject to restriction and application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examination of the subject to be subjected to by the Examination of the subject to be subjected to by the Examination of the subject to the subject to be subjected to by the Examination of the subject to subject to be subjected to by the Examination of the subject to subject	rawn from consideration. /or election requirement. ner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) and according a deplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct and according the oath or declaration is objected to by the left and according to the left according to the left and according to the left according to the	ne drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applic iority documents have been rece eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No ived in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:		

Application/Control Number: 10/697,534 Page 2

Art Unit: 2611

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed April 14, 2009, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-15 under 35 USC 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Agee et al (US 6,359,923).

Applicant argues that the Kasapi patent fails to teach the claimed feature of the CI coder adapted to provide subcarrier weights, since in that patents weights are applied to subcarriers and not provided by an encoder. Upon a review, examiner agrees with applicant's reading of the patent. A newly found prior art, Agee et al (US 6,359,923), is believed to teach this particular feature of the invention, as set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 3. Claims 1-4,6,9-12,14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiegandt et al in view of Agee et al (US 6,359,923).

Claim 1.

Wiegandt et al discloses in a carrier Interferometry (CI) transmitter:

a CI coder adapted to encode at least one data sequence (K^{th} bit) onto a CI code ($i\Delta\theta_k$) to produce at least one data-bearing code vector, and

Art Unit: 2611

a (OFDM) modulator adapted to modulate the at least one data-bearing code vector onto a plurality of subcarriers.

See Fig 2 (a) and (b), and page 661, first paragraph.

Wiegandt et al is silent on the coder for adjusting subcarrier weights.

Agee et al teaches a multicarrier communication where an encoder (1012) to adapted to further provide weights (1013) to the encoded data to increase bandwidth efficiency. See Fig. 8 and col. 15:55-66 in particular.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to adapt the CI coder of Wiegandt et al to provide weights to the code vectors for the purpose of increasing bandwidth efficiency as taught by Agee et al.

Claims 2 and 3.

OFDM modulators includes an IFFT which reads on "an invertible transform module."

See US patent 6,549,566 teaching an IFFT in an OFDM system for an example. In other words, in order to generate a plurality of subcarriers such as shown in Fig.2b of Wiegandt et al, an IFFT is commonly used.

Claim 4.

Agee et al teaches applying spreading codes to the encoded data generated by an encoder.

Claim 6.

Applying a spreading code is considered a channel coding.

Claims 9-12,14

Although Wiegandt et al does not describe a CI receiver, an OFDM demodulator and a CI decoder corresponding to the OFDM modulator and CI coder, as modified by Agee et al's teaching as explained above, would have been obvious by reversing the modulation and coding processes, as is commonly done in a communication system.

Page 4

4. Claims 5,7,13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiegandt in view of Agee et al, as applied to claims 1 and 6 above and further in view of Steer et al (US 2003/0103445).

Claims 5 and 13.

Steer et al teaches compensating frequency variation of the subcarriers in a DMT system for symbol timing and frequency control. See paragraph [0074]. Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to compensate the frequency shift in Wiegandt et al as taught by Steer et al.

Claim 7.

Wiegandt in combination with Agee et al discloses all the subject matter claimed except that at least one of the modulator and the CI coder is adapted to dynamically allocate subcarriers for at least one communication link.

Steer et al teaches dynamically allocating the subcarriers of OFDM to better accommodate the traffic requirements. See paragraph [0047].

Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to adapt the OFDM modulator to dynamically allocate subcarriers for at least one communication link for the purpose of better accommodating the traffic requirements, as taught by Steer et al.

Application/Control Number: 10/697,534 Page 5

Art Unit: 2611

and further in view of Kadous (US 6,801,580).

5. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiegandt et al in view of Agee et al as applied to claims 1 and 9 above respectfully as applied to claim 9 above,

Kadous teaches a successive interference cancellation in a multicarrier system. See col.5:17-24. Thus, it would have been obvious to further modify the receiver of Wiegandt et al, as modified by Agee et al, to adapt the demodulator to include a successive interference cancellation as taught by Kadous.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claim 8 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Y. Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-3039. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM --5PM M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shuwang Liu can be reached on 571-272-3036. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/697,534 Page 6

Art Unit: 2611

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kevin Y Kim/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2611